



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,635	07/16/2003	Myles Kimmitt	2333-US-C	1709
56436	7590	08/18/2008	EXAMINER	
3COM CORPORATION			MUL, GARY	
350 CAMPUS DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752-3064			2616	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/18/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/620,635	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KIMMITT, MYLES
	<b>Examiner</b> GARY MUI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 3, 2008 has been entered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan et al. (US 6,970,435 B1; hereinafter Buchanan) in view of Partyka (US 5,659,580).

For claim 1, Buchanan teaches concurrently generating a plurality of lesser width parallel data words containing parallel data from a greater width parallel data word (see column 2 lines 6 – 15 and column 4 lines 54 – 64; the bit stream is partition into four groups of four bit streams), wherein the number of bits in the greater width parallel data word is greater than the number of bits in each of the lesser width parallel data words (see column 4, lines 55 – 56); serializing parallel data representative of the plurality of lesser width parallel data words (see column 4, lines 62 – 64); and transmitting the serialized data words over a corresponding plurality of distinct serial data channels (see column 5, lines 16 – 17). Buchanan fails to explicitly teach interleaving bits of the greater width parallel data word across the lesser width parallel data words such that each successive bit of the greater width parallel word is contained within a different one of the lesser width parallel data words. Partyka from the same field of endeavor teaches the interleaving process reorders the data bits such that successive data bits are spread throughout the data block (see column 3 lines 55 – 61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to interleave the data as taught by Partyka and then have Buchanan partition the bit stream. The motivation for doing this is to increase the reliability of the system by allow the increasing the ability to correct bit errors.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan et al. (US 6,970,435 B1; hereinafter Buchanan) in view of Partyka (US 5,659,580) and further in view of Nishida et al. (US 5,978,486; hereinafter "Nishida").

For claim 2, Buchanan teaches concurrently generating a plurality of lesser width parallel data words containing parallel data from a greater width parallel data word (see column 2 lines 6 – 15 and column 4 lines 54 – 64; the bit stream is partition into four groups of four bit streams), wherein the number of bits in the greater width parallel data word is greater than the number of bits in each of the lesser width parallel data words (see column 4, lines 55 – 56); serializing parallel data representative of the plurality of lesser width parallel data words (see column 4, lines 62 – 64); and transmitting the serialized data words over a corresponding plurality of distinct serial data channels (see column 5, lines 16 – 17). Buchanan fails to explicitly teach interleaving bits of the greater width parallel data word across the lesser width parallel data words such that each successive bit of the greater width parallel word is contained within a different one of the lesser width parallel data words. Partyka from the same field of endeavor teaches the interleaving process reorders the data bits such that successive data bits are spread throughout the data block (see column 3 lines 55 – 61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to interleave the data as taught by Partyka and then have Buchanan partition the bit stream. The motivation for doing this is to increase the reliability of the system by allow the increasing the ability to correct bit errors. Buchanan fails to disclose scrambling the parallel data in the lesser width parallel data words to form a plurality of scrambled data words. Nishida from the same or similar field of endeavors teach scrambling the parallel data in the lesser width parallel data words to form a plurality of scrambled data words (see column 18, lines 33 – 36). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use scrambling the parallel data in the lesser width parallel data words to form a plurality of scrambled data words in the method

taught by Buchanan in order to allow easy clock recovery by averaging changes in amplitude, polarity, and phase of a transmitted signal (see column 1, lines 26 – 29).

*Conclusion*

6. **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular paragraphs or columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Mui whose telephone number is (571) 270-1420. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs. 9 - 3 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ricky Ngo/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
2616

/Gary Mui/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2616  
08/15/2008